

**REMARKS**

Claims 2, 3 and 5-13 are pending in the application.

Claims 9, 12 and 13 are objected to due to informalities. The claims are amended taking into consideration the Examiner comments. Withdrawal of the objections is requested.

Claims 2, 3, and 5-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Claims 2, 3, and 5-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Feldman (U.S. Patent No. 6,532,469) in view of Fukushige (U.S. Patent Publication 2002-0152051).

The claims are amended, a new claim is added, and, thus, the pending claims remain for reconsideration, which is requested.

To overcome the 112 rejection of independent claims 9-12, the phrase "time context" is changed to "chronological order." For example, the present application FIG. 17 and page 33, line 3 to page 34, line 18 support the claims, so the claims comply with the 35 USC 112, first paragraph, written description requirement. Withdrawal of the 112, first paragraph, rejection is requested.

Claim 9 has been amended to clarify that different documents having relevancy are displayed with chronological order maintained.

Fukushige discusses displaying a temporal relation of the document pairs. The Office Action Response to Arguments relies upon Fukushige FIG. 20 and paragraph 177, however, FIGS. 20-21 show a degree of belonging of a document to a category at a time point and a degree of belonging of the document at a later time point. That is, this figure shows a temporal change in relation to a classification parameter update of the same document in a degree of belonging to a classification. By contrast, claim 9 provides the following example benefits of (1) ***determining positions of objects indicative of different documents having relevancy with chronological order maintained***, (2) ***connecting the objects with association lines***, and (3) ***displaying the relation chart composed of the objects***. That is, a chronological order of different documents is displayed. Fukushige does not disclose expressly or implicitly these features. In other word, the language of amended claim 9 provides "***maintaining a***

**chronological order** of different documents forming each document pair **by laying out objects indicative of the documents on the relation chart, which has a time axis**, ... and ... **connecting between the objects of each document pair in the relation chart having the time axis**, depending on the calculated degree of relevancy” providing a benefit of “displaying the relation chart composed of the objects and the association lines, ... the objects indicative of the document pairs **having relevancy being displayed while maintaining chronological order a time context of the document pairs** in chronological order.”

In addition, the Office Action states that Feldman does not explicitly disclose displaying objects indicative of the documents pairs while maintaining their temporal relation.

Thus, a prima facie case of obviousness over Feldman and Fukushima cannot be established, because there is no evidence that it would be obvious to one skilled in the art to combine Feldman with Fukushima and then further modify Fukushima and/or Feldman to achieve the present invention's benefits of (1) **determining positions of objects indicative of different documents having relevancy with chronological order maintained**, (2) **connecting the objects with association lines**, and (3) **displaying the relation chart composed of the objects**, according to the language of claim 9 “**maintaining a chronological order of different documents forming each document pair by laying out objects indicative of the documents on the relation chart, which has a time axis**, ... and ... **connecting between the objects of each document pair in the relation chart having the time axis**, depending on the calculated degree of relevancy; and **displaying the relation chart composed of the objects and the association lines**, ... the objects indicative of the document pairs **having relevancy being displayed while maintaining chronological order a time context of the document pairs** in chronological order.” The Office Action Response to Arguments relies upon Fukushima paragraph 22, lines 1-5 for motivation to modify Fukushima, however, this paragraph only discusses generating a set of parameters for determining whether a document belongs to a predetermined category, which fails to expressly or implicitly disclose to one skilled in the art to modify Fukushima's categorization of a document based upon a generated parameter to also have “**maintaining a chronological order of different documents forming each document pair by laying out objects indicative of the documents on the relation chart, which has a time axis** ...”

In other words, the language of claim 9 provides “**laying out objects**” according to “a

***chronological order.***” The Office Action interpretation does not comply with 37 CFR 1.56 by not being a reasonable broad interpretation consistent with the specification to interpret the language of claim 9 “***maintaining a chronological order of different documents forming each document pair by laying out objects indicative of the documents on the relation chart, which has a time axis***” to be same as Fukushima’s determining whether a given document belongs to a predetermined category based upon a parameter, since document classification based upon a parameter differs from object layout. Further, the language of claim 9 requires the limitations of laying out objects to maintain a chronological order “***of different documents forming each document pair.***” Further, claim 9 in combination with this limitation requires the limitation of “***generating association lines for connecting between the objects of each document pair in the relation chart having the time axis***, depending on the calculated degree of relevancy.”

Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 9 and allowance of claim 9 is requested.

Independent claims 10-13 require limitations similar to the discussed limitations of claim 9.

New dependent claim 14 has been added to specifically recite the feature that three or more documents (objects) are arranged in chronological order in the same manner, which is not disclosed expressly or implicitly by the relied upon references. Allowance of dependent claim 14 is requested.

Other dependent claims recite patentably distinguishing features of their own or are at least patentably distinguishing due to their dependencies from the independent claims.

Withdrawal of the rejections of pending claims and allowance of pending claims is requested.

## CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,  
STAAS & HALSEY LLP

/Mehdi D. Sheikerz/

Date: \_\_\_\_\_ March 2, 2009 \_\_\_\_\_

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Mehdi D. Sheikerz  
Registration No. 41,307

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501